Rt. 8, Frederick, Md. 21701
12/25/74

Mr. Kevin Delaney
ABC News
1124 Connecticut Ave., NW
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Delaney,

Of the ways in which a childless man of my age can spend Xmas, I think none is more appropriate to the true spirit of the day than retrospection. And as I think backward and come to much that is troubling, including more first-hand experience with official corruption than most people encounter in a lifetime concentrated into less than a half-year, I find myself wondering how all of this is possible, how these people dare risk - even after Watergate - retribution.

My experience with ABC - not you - this is not personal - encapsulates it nicely if I may use that word.

The press has made it possible and continues to make it possible.

The decision with what I offered ABC News was not a news decision. It was policy, it was political and what bothers me most of all, it continues.

Now we have the new CIA scandal. ABC had my book and supposedly went over it carefully. Yet when this newest scandal was leaked and received considerable attention, when the word of officials became essential, that the former head of the CIA said he and all others would swear falsely if their concept of the Agency's need required it, nobody though this newsworthy or pertinent?

Now we have them all lying their heads off and the press, true to "objectivity," repeating all the lies faithfully.

Nothing as rich and as powerful as ABC would ever consider entering into a dialogue with so unimportant a man as I, but my real purpose in writing is to ask you to pass this along to the level that decided against use of what by any standard was the most significant and unquestionable fact and news.

If ever there was fact about which there could be no question of authenticity, that is what I offered ABC. It is an official transcript, obtained during litigation. While the limitations imposed upon TV uses restrict the number of legitimate stories I offered, there remain quite a few that, had they not dealt with government, sacred cows, political assassination and inherently the failure of the press, would not have been rejected. These would not have been, either, if the press had not decided as uniformly as though there had been a top-level meeting, to become an apologist for errant officialdom except where some official decides otherwise and leaks.

I don't think any real freedom can long survive this. And I do believe that any analytical examination of what has happened to freedom and our concepts of if beginning with World War II does show an increasing authoritarianism. The state of the world and the country strongly indicate that this trend will, inevitable, accelerate. This just happens to coincide with TV's coming into domination of news reporting - and non-reporting. The more TV took information to the people the worse the abuses of official power.

When I first spoke to you in August I told you that I have extensive files, that there is abundant confirmation of everything in the book and you were welcome to see whatever you wanted (you meaning ABC), and that I had extensive documentation of many other stories, all exclusives. When I am only an hour from your office, nobody came. And when nobody came, particularly with my experiences in government and more over the past eleven years, I knew then what the answer would be and that the real problem, no

matter I would be told, was finding some means of executive face-saving.

What someone supposedly checked out was at best peripheral to the main thrust of the book. However, it is a separate story and a legitimate and a completely accurate one. It today has increased topicality. I had but a fraction of it in the book. However, if ABC placed trust in the honesty or judgement of whatever "investigator" it had check me out, then if it is again going to impart this trust it would be well-advised to make its own examination. If in so long a time he could not find Campbell - and I'm taking your word on this -and I had to tell you the simple way of going it - the first question is of competence. The career of any cub who couldn't do that without leaving his office should have ended at that point.

If Campbell told him what you told me he did what I sent you alone should have raised questions about what Campbell finds important to Campbell at this stage of his career. However, there is a history to that part and it was checked out more than a year ago. You can satisfy yourself by phone. I did sell the whole Russell story to a publication which wanted something new to commemorate the 10th anniversary of the JFK assassination. They sent a reporter here. He was here more than a day. He went through all he wanted to, made copies of all he wanted and got confirmation from Campbell. After he wrote his story there was a policy decision against it. And I was told, quite honestly, that it was a policy decision. Even the reasons. That publication has a vulnerability.

What I am saying is that your man was told to find a reason to justify a rejection or he gulled ABC and I am quite willing to confront him on this. As you know, I do not know who he is but that makes no difference. If ABC was gulled, it can call my bluff if anyone thinks I'm bluffing. I have more letters from Campbell than I do from Russell, too. He wrote them for Russell.

All of this coincides with one of those other stories I said I would offer ABC as an exclusive if something came of my offer of the book. It is the story of CIA domestic intelligence and I've had part of it in documentary form going back to the days of those who today are so vocal in semantical denials that are not in any real sense denials. The truth is that it was more extensive than what has been reported. It includes a special front, what is called in the spookery a "cut-off," for psying that in my proof is on the public appearances of American citizens within the United States.

With my experiences of which you know, I did not phone you when I heard of the Times story. Today with such a story there is no real choice. Only the scandal sheets will even consider it. The major paper with a syndicate that saw these proofs almost seven years ago and declined did not recall them once the story broke. These are definitive enough: bills rendered, transcripts of what I said (carbons, that is, not xeroxes), checks in payment, a transcript of a conversation in which earlier surveillance is discussed and coming surveillance ordered, the original envelope in which payment for it was made and that check (disclosing the cover address and the identities of the payees, the front and the bank account) and even a tape on which I am described as holding "the all-time track record" of CIA interest in the field in which I work.

There is, of course, much more than this. What of that is relevant to it I have in the almost completed draft of my Watergate book, The Unimpeachment of Richard Nixon.

In this I am not claiming to have done what all the reporters and news agencies in Washington could not have done. But I am saying that it was not done and with Watergate it was even more newsworthy and should have been reported. When the press censors what the people can know, how can representative society work?

My purpose is not to chide you personally. It is not to say that ABC has a monopoly in abdicating its responsibilities. Nor from the record can it be for personal gain. The contrary is more likely and I have a long experience in which this has been the case.

Rather do I take this time despite all the experience that tells me I waste it in the hope that someone in a position of responsibility will himself think this and so many other cases like to through. And ask himself question I think should be obvious.

Someone with the authority to make decisions did more than reject absolutely solid work the legitimate news value of which was later reflected by the attention it received from both AP and UPI and the Post and its syndicate. I was working and did not catch ABC's commemoration of the JFK assassination anniversary. However, I've been told that this same authority went back to the cans and replayed old stuff that by then it also knew was false and self-serving. ABC was uniquely in a position to know it aired falsehood yet ~~the~~ decided to. Rehash at that!

This is not the only instance of which I know of ABC's casting itself in the role of government apologist in what it presents as news. While I was in Memphis during the Ray evidentiary hearing, where I did the investigating that led to the hearing what was presented in evidence in it, I caught one of your evening net newscasts. I could not in it recognize what had happened in court that day nor was it in any way faithful to anything that happened in court during the entire proceeding. Regardless of how the judge decides, the proof that was put into evidence and was subject to testing under both cross examination and rebuttal and remains not even challenged is by normal standards important news, much without precedent. The abuses in the Ellsberg case are trivialities compared to it. Again, I await the calling of any imagined bluff. In fact we set a new legal precedent, affirmed by the 6th cricuit court of appeals. The Supreme Court has asked for arguments by January 6 to decide whether to grant the State of Tennessee cert.

While I have neither children nor grandchildren with whom to spend the day, I am not withour concerns for those of others. I am not without concern for the kind of world in which these children and grandchildren of others will live. And I am not without concern for what history will record about their fathers and grandfathers and how they met their responsibilities. And didnIt.

There are records, of which mine are only part. Mine will end in some college or university. Two are currently interested in them. My mail tells me that there is not going to be any time in the future that I can see when there will not be sincere and extensive interest that cannot avoid how the press did and did not function.

If I regret what the record will show, I regret even more what it means.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg